

Supply—National Revenue

was too little and too late. This is not a political charge; this is a charge made by an economics professor who knows his onions and hails from the University of Toronto. It is a charge which is the product of two years of study to make a realistic appraisal of the housing requirements of this country.

Then the pamphlet goes on to refer to a thorough program and says:

Liberal policies for municipal development will operate as a part of a thorough national development program.

Farming communities often face particularly burdensome costs for municipal services.

And further on it says:

In all areas, a new Liberal government will work with the provinces and municipalities in a major campaign to provide more low rental homes.

I should like the minister to explain to the committee, in view of the major campaign to provide more low rental homes which is referred to in the pamphlet, how many more low rental homes have been provided in the two years the government has been in office. I dare say the number the minister is able to quote will fall short of the assessment made by the Murray report.

Then this statement appears on every one of the pamphlets and nothing could be more fantastic:

The Liberal party has, for today's problems, the answers which are progressive, realistic and responsible.

We want some progressive, realistic and responsible answers from the government regarding such criticisms as those levelled by this impartial and hard hitting report, a report which exposes inaction, lack of planning and lack of responsible programs to clear up our national housing mess.

The argument of the Minister of Finance that employing men in March, April and May under the municipal winter works incentive program, and so on, and then laying them off in June, July and August represents some kind of solution to unemployment is, I think, one of the prime reasons perhaps which prompted the government to pass what I refer to as gimmick legislation, legislation such as the \$500 winter built home bonus. This is what has prompted gimmick legislation rather than a realistic appraisal of what are the needs of national housing and the passing of legislation designed to meet those needs, and specifically those needs. If legislation is designed to meet housing needs and criticism such as that I have cited from the Murray report, then the resultant benefits to employment will occur as a matter of course.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

This point was made in an article which appeared in the Vancouver *Province*, a newspaper which circulates in the minister's own home riding, on August 31, 1964 under the heading: "A better place to spend defence dollars". It says:

A two year study by the Ontario association of housing authorities of Canada's attitude toward subsidized public housing declares this country's housing program is inadequate and late and that it bears "absolutely no relationship to any realistic appraisal of the need".

Then toward the end of the article the following appears:

A national housing program on this scale—

That is, the scale proposed by the report from which I have cited.

—might be the answer to those who question Canada's \$1.6 billion annual outlay on a largely obsolete defence establishment but argue that if this country did not spend so much on defence it would invite unemployment and dislocate business and industry.

A billion dollars a year on new houses would go a long way to reduce the shortage of adequate housing and few can argue that it would not be a good substitute in every way for a corresponding cut-back in defence spending.

Home construction gives work to carpenters, plumbers, electricians, bricklayers, architects, earthmovers, cement men and moneylenders. Home-building dollars percolate through every level of the economy.

That is what one of the prominent newspapers in the minister's own home province feels about the situation.

I should like to refer to another article, this time appearing in the Charlottetown *Guardian* on September 1, 1964. This article also writes up the Murray report and says, in part:

Present legislation, the study finds, offers little hope of meeting the "distressing housing circumstances of thousands of Canadian families". In order to achieve good housing for all Canadians by a 1980 target, 4 million new or rehabilitated dwellings will be needed—

And then it goes on to quote the remainder of certain portions of the report.

I feel that the arguments which I have heard advanced by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Finance in tying in this housing legislation—this what I call gimmick legislation—to meet the unemployment situation, is not a proper approach. The proper approach is to design legislation to provide adequate housing to meet the needs of Canada. To adopt the arguments of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Labour is rather an infantile approach, I believe, to economics. Certainly I am not an expert economist but I am sure that even my hon. friends opposite agree with me that the